

Donald E.J. Kilmer, Jr., (SBN: 179986)
Law Offices of Donald Kilmer
A Professional Corporation
1645 Willow Street, Suite 150
San Jose, California 95125
Voice: (408) 264-8489
Facsimile: (408) 264-8487
EMail: Don@DKLawOffice.com

Jason A. Davis (SBN: 224250)
Davis & Associates
30021 Tomas Street, Suite 300
Rancho Santa Margarita, CA 92688
Voice: (949) 310-0817
Facsimile: (949) 288-6894
EMail: Jason@CalGunLawyers.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

JOHN TEIXEIRA, STEVE
NOBRIGA, GARY GAMAZA,
CALGUNS FOUNDATION (CGF),
INC., SECOND AMENDMENT
FOUNDATION (SAF), INC., and
CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF
FEDERAL FIREARMS LICENSEES,
INC. (Cal-FFL),

Plaintiffs,

vs.

COUNTY OF ALAMEDA, ALAMEDA
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS (as a
policy making body), WILMA CHAN
in her official capacity, NATE MILEY
in his official capacity, and KEITH
CARSON in his official capacity.

Defendants.

CASE NO.: 3:12-CV-03288 SI

ERRATA MEMO RE:
Documents # 020 and 021

Date: December 21, 2012
Time: 9:00 a.m.
Place: United States District
Court - San Francisco
450 Golden Gate Ave.
Court: Courtroom 10, 19th Floor
Judge: Hon. Susan Illston

1. In the DECLARATION OF PLAINTIFFS: STEVE NOBRIGA, JOHN TEIXEIRA, GARY GAMAZA, (Doc # 020) at paragraph 9.a., the date should have read October 20, 2010 instead of October 20, 2012.
2. I mis-remembered the rule for the number of pages that triggered the necessity of a Table of Contents and a Table of Authorities for a Memorandum of Points and Authorities. As Plaintiffs' MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF A REQUEST FOR A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION (Doc # 21) is more than ten (10) pages, I have attached those tables to this errata memorandum.

Respectfully Submitted on December 7, 2012,

/s/ Donald Kilmer

Donald E.J. Kilmer, Jr., (SBN: 179986)
LAW OFFICES OF DONALD KILMER
A Professional Corporation
1645 Willow Street, Suite 150
San Jose, California 95125-3030
Telephone: 408/264-8489
Facsimile: 408/264-8487
E-Mail: Don@DKLawOffice.com

Attorney for Plaintiffs

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1		
2	INTRODUCTION.....	2
3	FACTS.....	2
4	SUMMARY OF ARGUMENTS.....	5
5	STATEMENT OF THE LAW.....	6
6	ARGUMENT.....	7
7	Plaintiffs Will Prevail on the Merits of Their Claims.....	7
8	The Board of Supervisors Wrongfully Considered the Appeal.....	8
9	The Defendants’ Measurements for the “500 Foot Rule” are Arbitrary.....	8
10	The “500 Foot Rule” is Not Rational.....	10
11	Plaintiffs will Suffer Irreparable Harm and the Equities Favor Them.....	12
12	CONCLUSION.....	13

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Federal Cases

<i>Alliance for Wild Rockies v. Cottrell</i> (9th Cir. 2011) 632 F.3d 1127.....	7
<i>Barnes v. Glen Theatre, Inc.</i> , 501 U.S. 560 (1991).....	10
<i>Buckhannon Bd & Care Home, Inc., et al., v.</i> <i>W. Virginia Dept of Health and Human Res., et. al.</i> , 532 U.S. 598 (2002).....	12
<i>Cantwell v. Connecticut</i> , 310 U.S. 296 (1940).....	9
<i>Citigroup Global Markets, Inc. v.</i> <i>VCG Special Opportunities Master Fund Ltd.</i> (2nd Cir. 2010) 598 F.3d 30.....	7
<i>City of L.A. v. Alameda Books</i> , 535 U.S. 425 (2002).....	8
<i>City of Renton v. Playtime Theatres, Inc.</i> , 475 U.S. 41 (1986).....	10
<i>District of Columbia v. Heller</i> , 554 U.S. 570 (2008)	7
<i>Ezell v. City of Chicago</i> , 651 F.3d 684, 708-709 (7 th Cir. 2011).....	11, 12
<i>Forsyth County v. Nationalist Movement</i> , 505 U.S. 123 (1992).....	9
<i>Heffron v. International Society for Krishna Consciousness, Inc.</i> 452 U.S. 640 (1981).....	9
<i>McDonald v. Chicago</i> , 561 U.S. ___, 130 S.Ct. 3020 (2010).....	7
<i>Niemotko v. Maryland</i> , 340 U.S. 268 (1963).....	9
<i>Nordyke v. King</i> , 681 F.3d 1041 (9 th Cir. 2012)(en banc).....	12
<i>Schad v. Mt. Ephraim</i> , 452 U.S. 61 (1981).....	8
<i>Shuttlesworth v. Birmingham</i> , 394 U.S. 147 (1969).....	9
<i>Southeastern Promotions, Ltd. v. Conrad</i> , 420 U.S. 546 (1975).....	9
<i>Winter v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.</i> (2008) 555 U.S. 7.....	6
<i>Young v. American Mini Theatres, Inc.</i> , 427 U.S. 50 (1976).....	8

State Cases

<i>Doe v. City and County of San Francisco</i> , 136 Cal. App. 3d 509.....	11
<i>Fiscal v. City and County of San Francisco</i> , 158 Cal. App. 4 th 895.....	11